PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

28 MAY 2004

From the			
NTERNATIONAL	PRELIMINARY	EXAMINING	AUTHORITY

To: Waters, Jeffrey WATERS, Jeffrey Marconi Intellectual Property

WRITTEN OPINION

Crompton Close Basildon Essex SS14 3BA GRANDE BRETAGNE		(PCT Rule 66)				
		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	26/05/2004			
Applicant's or agent's file reference P/63066/DSIC	<u>.</u>	REPLY DUE	within 1/00 months/days from the above date of mailing			
International application No.	International filing date	(day month year)	Priority date (day/month/year)			
PCT/GB03/02825	02/07/2003		03/07/2002			
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC						
	G06K7/00					
Applicant						
MARCONI UK INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ET AL.						

-								
1.	. This writ	ten opinion is the first drawn up by this International I	Preliminary Examining Authority.					
2.	2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:							
	ı X	I X Basis of the opinion						
	II [Priority						
	III [Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelt	y, inventive step and industrial applicability	y				
	IV [Lack of unity of invention						
	v X	Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regacitations and explanations supporting such statement	ard to novelty, inventive step or industrial	applicability;				
	VI [Certain documents cited						
	VII Certain defects in the international application							
	VIII Certain observations on the international application							
3.	The applic	cant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.						
	When?	See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may,	before the expiration of that time limit, re	quest this Authority				
	to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d). How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.							
	Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.							
	If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.							
4.	The final o	date by which the international preliminary on report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is	:03/11/2004	- aisches Patentamr				
Nar	ne and mai	iling address of the IPEA/	Authorized officer	430				

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Netherlands Tel.: (+31-70) 340-2040 Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits) Tel. (+49-89) 2399 2828

Examiner

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (march 2002)

!>

- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.